

REMARKS

Examiner's comments in the Office Action marked "FINAL" and dated July 20, 2007 have been read and carefully considered by Applicants. In view of such comments, Applicants have amended the set of claims in the present Application as set forth hereinabove. In particular, independent claims 1, 10, and 19 and also dependent claims 2-9, 11-18, and 20 have all been amended to better highlight the patentable differences of Applicants' proposed invention as compared to the prior art cited by Examiner in the Office Action. In amending these claims, Applicants maintain that no new matter has been impermissibly introduced into the present Application. Since no claims have been altogether cancelled and no entirely new claims have been added herein by Applicants, claims 1-20 thus remain pending in Applicants' present Application for Examiner's consideration.

At the present time, it is Applicants' good faith belief that the pending claims, as presented herein, are both novel and non-obvious in view of all known prior art and that the claims properly comply with all applicable statutory requirements. Therefore, Applicants respectfully aver that the pending claims now place the present Application in a condition for allowance and notice thereof is respectfully requested.

Amendments to the Specification:

Also, in the present Amendment, Applicants have amended original paragraphs 0008-0010, 0022, 0029, 0032, 0033, and 0039 of the written specification in the Application. (See amended paragraphs set forth hereinabove.) In general, these paragraphs in the specification have largely been amended so as to merely correct obvious typographical errors, word omissions, and/or grammatical errors that were present in the Application as originally filed. Therefore, in making such amendments to the specification, Applicants again respectfully maintain that no new matter has been impermissibly added to the present Application.

Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2:

In the Office Action, Examiner rejected claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶ 2 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and claim subject matter that Applicants regard as their invention. In particular, Examiner rejected independent claim 1 as having insufficient

antecedent bases for original limitations "the initial steering wheel angle input" and "the ... first steering wheel input" set forth therein.

In response, Applicants have herein amended claim 1 and replaced original limitation "the initial steering wheel angle input" with amended limitation "said initial steering wheel angle" and also replaced original limitation "the ... first steering wheel input" with amended limitation "said new steering wheel angle." In view of such, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner's rejection(s) of claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶ 2 be withdrawn.

Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and § 103(a):

Also, in the Office Action, Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 8-10, 12, 13, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated, and therefore rendered unpatentable, by "A Study of Lateral Vehicle Control Under a 'Virtual' Force Framework," which was published for Eric J. Rossetter *et al.* in 2002 (hereinafter "Rossetter"). In addition, Examiner rejected claims 2, 5-7, 11, and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being rendered obvious, and therefore unpatentable, by Rossetter in view of "Vehicle Lateral Control for Automated Highway Systems," which was published for R.T. O'Brien *et al.* in 1996 ("O'Brien"). Furthermore, Examiner rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being rendered obvious, and therefore unpatentable, by Rossetter in view of "Differential-Braking-Based Rollover Prevention for Sport Utility Vehicles with Human-in-the-Loop Evaluations," which was published for Bo-Chiuan Chen *et al.* in 2001 ("Chen"). Lastly, Examiner rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being rendered obvious, and therefore unpatentable, by Rossetter in view of Chen and in further view of O'Brien.

In response, Applicants have amended all claims 1-20 as set forth hereinabove. In view of the claims as amended herein and also remarks set forth both herein and in previously submitted Amendments, Applicants now respectfully traverse the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and § 103(a) rejections set forth in the Office Action and request that the rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the claims as amended and also the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-20 are both novel and non-obvious with respect to the disclosures and teachings of Rossetter, O'Brien, and Chen and that the claims now properly comply with all statutory requirements. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner's claim rejections in the Office Action be withdrawn and that a Notice of Allowance be issued for all claims 1-20.

Also, together with this Amendment, a "Request for Continued Examination" (RCE) is being submitted along with an appropriate fee.

Should Examiner have any questions with respect to any matter now of record, Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

DICKINSON WRIGHT PLLC



John A. Artz, Reg. No. 25,824
38525 Woodward Avenue, Suite 2000
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48304-5092
telephone: (248) 433-7200
facsimile: (248) 433-7274

Date: January 22, 2008

BLOOMFIELD 36190-38 892335v1